

dik

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION  
WRIT PETITION NO.1261 OF 2012**

Dena Bank ... Petitioner.  
Vs.  
The Central Information Commission & Anr. ... Respondents.

Mr.Sunil Raghani i/by Mr.PDS & Associates for the Petitioner.  
None for the respondents.

**CORAM : RANJIT MORE J.  
DATE : 19<sup>th</sup> APRIL, 2012.**

**P.C.**

1. The petitioner is the bank constituted under the Banking Companies (Acquisition and Transfer of Undertakings ) Act 1970. The respondent No.2 filed an application under the Right to Information Act to the Central Public Information Officer of the petitioner seeking certain information. The application was rejected by the Central Public Information Officer of the petitioner. Respondent No.2 thereafter approached Appellate Authority under the Right to Information Act by way of an appeal. The Appellate Authority rejected application of the respondent No.2. Respondent No.2 thereafter preferred Second Appeal under Section 19 of the said Act before first respondent and first respondent allowed this appeal and directed the petitioner to furnish the information sought by the respondent No.2.

2. Respondent No.2's application seeking certain information was

rejected by the petitioner on the ground that the information is exempted under Section 8(1)(j) of the Right to Information Act, 2005. Section 8(1)(j) of the Right to Information Act reads as follows;

“8(1)(j) information which relate to personal information the disclosure of which has not relationship to any public activity or interest, or which would cause unwarranted invasion of the privacy of the individual unless the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer or the appellate authority, as the case may be, is satisfied that the larger public interest justifies the disclosure of such information”

3. The respondent No.2 by the application requested for a copy of the Office Note, Letters of Revocation and suspension in the trap cases by Central Bureau of Investigation under the Prevention of Corruption Act reported in the last 10 years in which the petitioner allowed revocation of the suspension of bank officials. Plain reading of the provisions of Section 8(1)(j) makes it abundantly clear that the information sought by the respondent No.2 is not exempted under the said Section. Impugned order cannot be faulted, therefore, no reason to interfere with the impugned order in writ jurisdiction of this Court under Article 227 of the Constitution of India. Writ Petition is therefore dismissed.

[ RANJIT MORE, J ]